



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COPY

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

DOCKET  
GHG-IP

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/530,236	04/04/2005	Shunji Mitsuyoshi	37026-88082	1272

22807 7590 07/31/2009  
GREENSFELDER HEMKER & GALE PC  
SUTTE 2000  
10 SOUTH BROADWAY  
ST LOUIS, MO 63102

EXAMINER

LERNER, MARTIN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/31/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 20 2009

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/530,236	MITSUYOSHI, SHUNJI	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	MARTIN LERNER	2626	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) MARTIN LERNER.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) PETER GILSTER.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 29 July 2009.Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_Claim(s) discussed: Claims 7 to 9.Identification of prior art discussed: None.Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Martin Lerner/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2626U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
PTOL-413 (Rev. 04-03)

Interview Summary

Paper No. 20090729A

AUG 20 2009

**Summary of Record of Interview Requirements****Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record**

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

**Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews  
Paragraph (b)**

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

**37 CFR § 1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.**

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,  
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

**Examiner to Check for Accuracy**

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

## Continuation Sheet (PTOL-413)

Application No. 10/530,236

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Martin Lerner called Peter Gilster to discuss the issues under 35 U.S.C. §101 and 35 U.S.C. §112 1st ¶. Martin Lerner stated that he wished to avoid an appeal, but the Patent Office was emphasizing these issues under 35 U.S.C. §101, and would have to go to appeal if necessary. Peter Gilster said that the client requested some way for rendering the program claims patentable under 35 U.S.C. §101. Martin Lerner stated that he believed the only option was to cancel these claims, or file a continuation-in-part application including disclosure of a computer readable medium. Martin Lerner noted that it was commonly the practice for applications directed to computer programs to include disclosure of a computer readable medium.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 20 2009

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.govDOCKET  
GHG-IP

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/530,236	04/04/2005	Shunji Mitsuyoshi	37026-88082	1272

22807 7590 07/31/2009  
GREENSFELDER HEMKER & GALE PC  
SUITE 2000  
10 SOUTH BROADWAY  
ST LOUIS, MO 63102

EXAMINER

LERNER, MARTIN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2626

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/31/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 20 2009

<b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	Application No. 10/530,236	Applicant(s) MITSUYOSHI, SHUNJI	
	Examiner MARTIN LERNER	Art Unit 2626	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 26 June 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_ (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 1 to 6.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 7 to 9.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.

12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Martin Lerner/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2626

Application No. 10/530,236

## Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The Specification, Page 12, Line 15 to Page 13, Line 1, is being reconsidered as requested by Applicant, but does not overcome the rejection. There is complete agreement for the fact that the Specification discloses a computer program, and that the computer program is disclosed to be run on a computer, and even that the program is associated with the computer. The problem arises as to whether Applicant can claim "a computer readable medium" given what is disclosed by the Specification. Moreover, the limitation of "stored on a computer" is problematic both because the limitation does not clearly satisfy the requirement of a "computer readable medium" for purposes of 35 U.S.C. §101 in accordance with the policy of the USPTO, and because it is unclear whether there is express support for the limitation of "stored in a computer" in Applicant's Specification so as to satisfy 35 U.S.C. §112, 1<sup>st</sup> ¶. Applicant's position ultimately rests upon simply saying that the computer readable medium is "implied" or "inherent". The implied or inherent aspect of a computer readable medium is what is not persuasive. If Applicant were permitted to prevail on an argument that a computer readable medium is implied or inherent, then there would appear to be no point to the USPTO's requirement because then any Applicant could simply argue that the computer readable medium is implied or inherent. Nor does there appear to be any way for the Examiner to make a suggestion for language that can save claims 7 to 9 because the lack of disclosure of a computer readable medium is a basic defect of the original Specification. Applicant could file a Continuation-in-Part to add disclosure of a computer readable medium, and claim the computer readable medium in claims of the Continuation-in-Part. Given, however, that the majority of the significant claims are already allowed, and while it is understood that Applicant wishes to provide coverage for any potential sale of a computer readable medium embodying the program, it is not seen why Applicant persists in resisting cancellation at this time of claims 7 to 9, which appears to be the only reasonable option.